REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Final Office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11, and 13-15, were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Kuo*, *Wu*, and *Sarkkinen*.

Additionally, objection was made to claims 6 and 13 for their multiple-dependencies, including dependencies upon cancelled claims 3 and 5 and 10 and 12, respectively. Notation was further made with respect to the title of the specification and of the layout of the specification. And, a requirement was entered to label Figures 1-3 with the words, "PRIOR ART".

In response to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended, as set forth herein, in manners believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited combination of references. Additional amendments to claims 6, 8, and 13 are made to overcome objections thereto and to correct for informalities.

As now-presented, the independent claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited combination of references for reasons that follow.

In the rejection of the claims, the Examiner relied upon *Kuo* for disclosing a method of processing messages received by a device from a network including receiving a message that indicates that the device should be in a dedicated channel state. The Examiner acknowledged that *Kuo* fails to teach the message being a message other than a reconfiguration message. The Examiner relied upon *Wu* for disclosing a Cell Update Confirm that is not a reconfiguration message. And, the Examiner further acknowledged that *Kuo* fails to teach the step of clearing from the device any record of a cell identifier. The Examiner relied upon *Sarkkinen* for showing this step.

Claim 1 recites a method of processing messages received by a device from a network. The claim has been amended, now to recite the step of receiving a message at the device that indicates that the device should be in a dedicated channel state. Claim 8 has been analogously amended. Support for this amendment is found in the specification, for instance, on page 7, lines 24-26, page 8, lines 24-27, and page 10, lines 4-6. Claim 8 has been analogously amended.

Reliance upon the combination of *Kuo* and *Wu* for disclosing the step of receiving, as now-recited, is believed to be misplaced.

5

While *Kuo* discloses a UE 40 and UTRAN 20, and that paragraphs 7, 8, and 10, as well as others, make reference to a CELL_DCH state 82, these sections do not disclose reception of a message at the UE to indicate that the UE should be in the CELL_DCH state. Additionally, while paragraph 11 makes reference to transitioning of the UE into a CELL_DCH state, neither this paragraph, nor others, disclose the recited method step. In addition, therefore, to the subject matter already acknowledged by the Examiner not to be disclosed in *Kuo*, namely, disclosure of a CELL UPDATE CONFIRM message, a URA UPDATE CONFIRM message, or an RRC connection set-up message, *Kuo* further fails to disclose reception of a message at the UE to indicate that the UE should be in a dedicated channel state. And, irrespective of the messages that are disclosed in *Wu*, the reference is directed towards resynchronization of a PDCP sequence number (see, e.g., paragraph 10) and does not disclose a step of receiving a message at a UE to indicate that the UE should be in a dedicated channel state. Applicant believes, therefore, that no combination of *Kuo* and *Wu* is formable to create the first step of the method of claim 1, as now-presented.

Additionally, reliance upon *Sarkkinen* for disclosing the step of clearing from the device any record of a cell identifier is also believed to be misplaced.

While acknowledging that *Kuo* fails to disclose the step of clearing from the device any record of a cell identifier, there further is no disclosure in *Sarkkinen* of such a step. While paragraphs 76-79 pertain to cleaning of old information from a database, the database is located at the network, not at a device at which a message is received from the network, as recited in claim 1. Paragraph 77, for instance, states that the old RNC (Radio Network Controller) deletes records from the database. The step of clearing from the device of any record of a cell identifier, recited in claim 1, as now-presented, is not shown in *Sarkkinen*.

For these reasons, therefore, claim 1 recites operation that is distinguishable over the combination relied upon by the Examiner. As the remaining dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective parent claims, these claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited combination of references for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.

Amendments made to Figures 1-3 are believed to overcome the Examiner's objections to the drawings. With respect to the Examiner's comments regarding the title and the arrangement

6

of the specification, amendments submitted in a response dated November 18, 2005, are believed to have been responsive to the Examiner's notation. Further amendment to the title or to the arrangement of the specification is not believed to be necessary.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 8, as now-presented, and the remaining ones of the dependent claims, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly.
Registration No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com